

UNITED STATE EPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR			ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/082,557	05/21/98	BECKER		D	203-2391-CON
_		owoo /0.412	¬ [EXAMINER
JOHN C ANDRE	<u> </u>	QM32/0412	,	CARTER,	R
UNITED STATES SURGICAL 150 GLOVER AVENUE NORWALK CT 06856		CORPORATION	[ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		• •		3736	1

DATE MAILED

14/12/104

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No. **09/082,557**

Applic(s)

Becker et al.

Examiner

Ryan Carter

Group Art Unit 3736



X Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>Mar 27, 2000</u>	
X This action is FINAL .	
☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosec in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quay\835 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.	cution as to the merits is closed
A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire3 month longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained 37 CFR 1.136(a).	or response will cause the
Disposition of Claim	
	is/are pending in the applicat
Of the above, claim(s)	_ is/are withdrawn from consideration
Claim(s)	is/are allowed.
∑ Claim(s) 10-36	is/are rejected.
Claim(s)	is/are objected to.
☐ Claims are subject	t to restriction or election requirement.
Application Papers See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948. The drawing(s) filed on	d). e been Rule 17.2(a)).
Attachment(s) Notice of References Cited, PTO-892 Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). Interview Summary, PTO-413 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948 Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152	
SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES	

Application/Control Number: 09/082,557 Page 2

Art Unit: 3736

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement filed 9/2/98 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1), which requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 10-36 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-9 of U. S. Patent No. 5,772,659 since the claims, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the patent.

Application/Control Number: 09/082,557 Page 3

Art Unit: 3736

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the patent and is covered by the patent since the patent and the application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: a constant power control circuit for an electrosurgical generator.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant was prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application during prosecution of the application which matured into a patent. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

- (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.
- 5. Claims 29-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lindenmeier et
- al. Lindenmeier et al. disclose a system for controlling the operation of a high frequency cutting device, comprising means for controlling the output voltage in response to the circuit impedance.
- 6. Claims 29-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shipp.

Application/Control Number: 09/082,557 Page 4

Art Unit: 3736

Shipp discloses a power control for a electrocautery unit, comprising means for providing automatic feedback and control of the output power, in accordance with one of multiple power levels selected by the user.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent No. 5,749,871 issued to Hood et al.

7. This is a CPA of applicant's earlier Application No. 09/082,557. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however,

Art Unit: 3736

event will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ryan Carter whose telephone number is (703) 308-2990.

CARY O'CONNOR

SUPERVISØRY PATENTEXAMI GROUP 3700

rcc RCC

April 10, 2000